



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/508,402	03/22/2005	Christiane Boie	CS8339/LeA 35,871	1903
34469	7590	06/26/2008	EXAMINER	
BAYER CROPSCIENCE LP			YOUNG, SHAWQUIA	
Patent Department				
2 T.W. ALEXANDER DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/508,402	BOIE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHAWQUIA YOUNG	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 4-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/11/05</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the instant application.

I. *Priority*

The instant application is a 371 of PCT/EP03/02413, filed on March 10, 2003 and claims benefit of Foreign Application GERMANY 102 12 886.3, filed on March 22, 2002.

II. *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on May 11, 2005 is in partial compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been partially considered by the examiner.

III. *Restriction/Election*

A. *Election: Applicant's Response*

Applicants' election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on March 27, 2008 is acknowledged.

Subject matter not encompassed by elected Group I are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142 (b), as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

IV. *Rejections*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. The term "unwanted" in claim 3 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "unwanted" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been described. They are:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,

5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

The nature of the invention

Applicants are claiming a composition for controlling unwanted microorganism.

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art

The state of the prior art is that microorganisms, for example, remain highly unpredictable. Enablement for the scope of controlling microorganisms is not present in the specification. According to the specification, microorganism is defined as fungi, bacteria and viruses. Applicants have failed to define the term "controlling" and thus the Examiner has interpreted the term to embrace treating, preventing, curing, etc.

Furthermore, there is a vast range of causes for the problem and biochemical pathways that mediate all types of microorganism that affect the various systems. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, microorganisms arise and one treatment cannot be used to treat all types of microorganisms.

Applicants' claims are therefore drawn to a pharmaceutical composition for treating or preventing all types of viruses. Applicants have failed to indicate the subject which will be treated using the claimed invention and thus Applicants' claims include humans, animals, plants, etc.

Therefore applicants are claiming a method of treating or preventing a HIV infection by administering a compound of the formula (I). As such, the specification fails to enable the skilled artisan to use the compounds of the formula (I) to treat HIV. In addition, there is no proof that the claimed compounds have ever been administered to a human or to an animal model. The obstacles to therapeutic approaches and vaccine development with regard to retroviruses associated with AIDS in humans are well documented in the literature. See, for example, Huff {J. Med. Chem. 34(8) 1991, p. 2305-2314} on page 2314. These obstacles include and are not limited to: 1) the extensive genomic diversity associated with HIV, particularly with respect to the gene encoding the envelope protein, 2) the fact that the modes of viral transmission include virus-infected mononuclear cells, which pass the infecting virus to other cells in a convert form, as well as via free virus transmission, 3) existence of a latent form of the virus, 4) the ability of the retrovirus to traverse the blood brain barrier and 5) the complexity and variation of the elaboration of the disease. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting therapeutic regimen on its face. In addition, there is no established correlation between in vitro activity and accomplishing treatment of HIV infections, in vivo, and those skilled in the art would not accept allegations in the instant specification to be reliable predictors of success, and those skilled in the art would not be able to use the compounds of the formula (I) since there is no description of an actual method wherein HIV infection in a host is treated.

There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples

There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the subjects who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the numerous microorganisms claimed herein. That a single class of compounds can be used to treat or control all types of microorganism embraced by the claims is an incredible finding for which Applicants have not provided supporting evidence. Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating, controlling or preventing any or all conditions by administering the instant claimed compounds.

Applicants have provided data for treating specific types of bacteria and fungi that are present on several types of crops.

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims is a composition for controlling unwanted microorganisms. Applicants have defined microorganisms as fungi, bacteria and viruses. Applicants have failed to disclose what subjects can be treated using the claimed invention and thus the claims include mammals, plants, kitchen surfaces, etc.

The quantity of experimentation needed

The nature of the pharmaceutical arts is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities for each of the microorganisms instantly claimed. The quantity of experimentation needed would be undue when faced with the lack of direction and guidance present in the instant specification in regards to testing all the microorganisms generically embraced in the claim language, and when faced with the unpredictability of the pharmaceutical art. Thus, factors such as “sufficient working examples”, “the level of skill in the art” and predictability, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims.

The level of the skill in the art

Even though the level of skill in the pharmaceutical art is very high, based on the unpredictable nature of the invention and state of the prior art and lack of guidance and direction, one skilled in the art could not use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

V. Objections

Claim Objection-Non Elected Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 3 are objected to as containing non-elected subject matter. To overcome this objection, Applicant should submit an amendment deleting the non-elected subject matter.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Applicants' abstract has two paragraphs.

VI. Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawquia Young whose telephone number is 571-272-9043. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph M^cKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Shawquia Young/
Examiner, Art Unit 1626

/Kamal A Saeed, Ph.D./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626